

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/668,441	Applicant(s) MIAO, BINGJIE	
	Examiner Phuong-Thao Cao	Art Unit 2164	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Phuong-Thao Cao, Examiner. (3) Rochelle Lieberman, Attorney (Reg. No 39,276).
 (2) Luke Wassum, Primary Examiner. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 18 October 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: Amended Claims.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,7 and 13.


Identification of prior art discussed: Lindsay et al. (US Patent 6,105,020).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


 18 October 2006


CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Attorney and Examiners discussed on the nature of the invention and whether the proposed amendment of claims overcame 101 and 102 rejections. The Primary Examiner explained what could be interpreted as tangible result required for method claims and suggested "displaying the query result" as a result of the querying process of the invention to overcome 101 rejection relating to claim 1 which was rejected as a method claim without tangible result. Amended claims 7 and 13 proposed by the Attorney were agreed by the Examiner as overcome the prior art and 101 rejections regarding claims 7 and 13.